

served as an example and friend to many in our community.

I would like to take a few minutes to tell my colleagues in the Senate about Paul's great support and dedication to higher education. He is an exemplary educator and a well respected and committed member of our local community.

Though Paul is retiring from his current position as university president, we are pleased that he will remain at the university as chancellor and will continue to be a role model in our community.

Paul Dixon was born in Cincinnati, OH, and graduated from Tennessee Temple University in 1961, and Temple Baptist Theological Seminary in 1964. After graduation, Paul spent 14 years as an evangelist where he traveled the country preaching and ministering to communities and churches and spoke for professional sports chapel programs, including the Cincinnati Reds and the Bengals, the former Houston Oilers, and most of the National League of baseball. He moved from Chattanooga, TN, to Cedarville, OH, in 1971 with his wife Pat, took a position with the faculty of the Language and Literature Department of then Cedarville College.

In 1978, Cedarville University trustee member Donald Tyler recommended Paul to the board of trustees as a replacement for the retiring university president, Dr. James T. Jeremiah. At the time, Donald was sure the idea of an evangelist serving as president would shock his fellow trustees. But, as Dr. Murray Murdoch's book, "Cedarville College: A Century of Commitment," tells the story, Donald Tyler felt compelled to suggest the successful young evangelist to the board as a candidate for the college's next leader.

Donald Tyler already knew Paul well as an influential evangelist. But he also observed Paul's interest in and involvement with college students as a Cedarville resident and husband of a faculty member. Even though he was not a CEO or business leader, Paul demonstrated leadership skills and began to establish himself as a visionary within the community. Ultimately, these observations convinced Donald that Paul was the right person to serve as the new president, and the entire board of trustees agreed. A glance at the past 25 years of Paul's tenure reveals Donald Tyler's instincts served the university well.

Paul's success as president of Cedarville University may be due in part to his God-given ability to balance stability and change.

With a strong vision and foresight, Paul led the university into a period of tremendous growth. Throughout his 25 years of leadership, \$100 million in facilities have been built on a campus that has expanded from 180 to 400 acres. The school attained university status in the year 2000 and now offers more than 100 programs of study, including a

graduate degree. Enrollment grew from 1,185 students in 1978 to more than 3,000 students today. Dr. Dixon also championed the university's focus on technology, positioning the institution as an award-winning leader and pioneer in the digital age.

I must say, Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, that the quality students that Cedarville University produces is really a testament to Dr. Paul Dixon as a role model and to the high standards he sets for the faculty and for the students. Without question, Paul Dixon sets the bar high. But the young people—the young people—who graduate from Cedarville University not only leave the school with a diploma, but they also leave the school with a strong set of values to guide them in their future lives. That is due, in no small part, to Dr. Paul Dixon's dedication to each and every student and to his commitment to leading by example.

Apart from Paul's contributions to the growth and success of Cedarville University and its students, he is an admired leader throughout the surrounding community. KeyBank President William Hann said this of Paul:

Paul is value-driven. He is admired by the entire business community because of his character, compassion, and leadership.

Also, Mike Stephens, president of Greene Memorial Hospital in nearby Xenia, OH, and former Cedarville University student, said this:

I have worked with Dr. Dixon on several community leadership activities. He is a well respected and sought after community leader, both for his ideas and vision.

Over the years, Paul Dixon has served the area through his leadership on several local business and community boards.

He served on the regional board of directors for KeyBank in Dayton, was a member of the Springfield/Clark County Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, and was a part of the Greene County Development Task Force, as well as the Greene County Blue Ribbon Committee.

In addition to serving on these boards and committees, Paul Dixon has hosted several events at the university aimed at community outreach and development. Every year, Dr. Dixon has hosted Farmer's Night, with about 250 to 300 local farmers attending, and Community Night, with about 400 community leaders in attendance. These events have brought people together to share problems, success stories, and ideas to better improve our community.

Jackie Pyles, a resident of Cedarville, had this to say about Dr. Dixon:

Through "Farmer's Night," "Community Night," and consulting area businessmen in their areas of expertise, Dr. Dixon has brought the University and community into a relationship where they are more supportive of each other. With Dr. Dixon's genuineness, love for people, and his sincere sensitivity, he has helped people not look at the University as a separate entity, but rather as an intricate part of this community.

I couldn't agree more.

Paul Dixon has positively influenced the individual lives of so many, but particularly his students. Students, university staff members, and people in the surrounding community all speak of Paul's love for people and his impeccable personal integrity. Reflecting upon this legacy, current trustee member Dr. Eugene Apple said this:

The accomplishments during Dr. Dixon's tenure as president are well known and very impressive: new programs, campus expansion, enrollment growth, and on and on. Having served on the Board of Trustees for more than 20 years, I noted one characteristic that seemed to rise above all else—his integrity, not only with the Cedarville family, but in a very quiet way with others in need of support, advice, consultation, and help.

The mantle of his presidency has been passed on to Dr. William E. Brown, former president of Bryan College of Dayton, TN. And I congratulate Dr. Brown and welcome him to our community. As I said, Dr. Dixon will not be far away. He will continue to preach, continue to represent the university among a variety of constituencies, and tell the Cedarville University story wherever he goes. Paul will end his presidency the way he began it, and that is by serving people and by serving the community.

Paul has a famous motto: "Everything we do ought to have quality stamped all over it." It is well known by Cedarville University students, staff, faculty, and the surrounding community. It truly captures the essence of who Dr. Paul Dixon is as a person and his mission in life. As the longest-serving college president in Ohio and the 12th longest-serving president in our Nation, Paul's example of stability, commitment, leadership, faithfulness, and quality is unparalleled.

My wife, Fran, and I extend our deepest appreciation to Dr. Paul Dixon for his dedication to college students, his leadership in higher education in Ohio, and his service to the village of Cedarville and the surrounding area. We both cherish Paul and his wife Pat's friendship and wish them our warmest congratulations and an enjoyable retirement.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise to share with the Members of this esteemed body the story of Lance Corporal Donald John Cline. John's wife Tina wants to make sure that their young sons know that their dad was "a proud father, a proud husband, and a proud Marine." Dakota, two and a half, and Dillon, 7 months, won't be able to know him as they grow up because their father gave his life in Iraq to protect this nation and defend our freedom. As part of the legacy he left to his boys, I honor him today.

John and Tina met and became friends in 1997 when their families lived in the same apartment complex and both attended Reed High School in

Sparks, NV. According to Tina, John always wanted to be a Marine, and he was already signed up and ready to join during his senior year of high school.

John graduated from Marine boot camp on October 20, 2000. The next day, he and Tina were married at the American Legion Hall. John was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 2nd Marine Regiment of the 2nd Marine Expeditionary Brigade based at Camp Lejeune, NC. Just after last Christmas, John received his orders to ship out to the Middle East.

On March 23, John was killed in an amphibious vehicle hit by enemy fire during an ambush in the southern Iraq town of An Nasiriyah. Lance Corporal Cline was 21 years old when he died. Tina says that she "saw a teenager grow up to be a man."

Unfortunately, I did not know John, but I can assure you that the dedication of this brave, proud Marine has touched my life. John's service to this Nation, on behalf of all of us, is truly inspiring. I want Tina and her boys to know that we are a grateful Nation for the man John became and for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and freedom-loving nations around the world.

I know my colleagues join me in praying for strength for John's wife and children as they deal with the loss of this American hero. As his young sons grow, I hope they will realize how grateful this Nation is for their sacrifice and the ultimate sacrifice that their father made.

God bless the Cline family.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, over the past few months the International Criminal Court, ICC, has taken important steps towards becoming an effective forum to hold accountable those accused of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. By all accounts, the countries participating in these negotiations did an excellent job of selecting qualified jurists and, perhaps most importantly, a responsible and experienced prosecutor.

But an important voice is missing from these negotiations. That voice is the United States, a country which was founded on the principles of the rule of law, human rights, and democratic freedoms.

Perhaps more than at any other time, the past few months have highlighted the folly of the Bush administration's policy towards the ICC.

The whole world wants the United States to be involved with the development of this institution. Yet, instead of seizing this opportunity to shape the Court in our interests, we are one of the only democracies sitting on the sidelines—joined by some of the world's worst human rights offenders. It is an embarrassment, and contrary to the arguments of those who oppose the Court, it is self-defeating.

Instead of making sure that the ICC will function the way we want it to,

this Administration withdrew our signature from the Rome Treaty and supported legislation, the American Service Members Protection Act, openly hostile to the ICC.

Instead of working to influence the selection of judges, prosecutors, and other ICC officials, our negotiators are not even sitting at the table.

Has the administration taken this position because they believe engagement is not a viable strategy to promote U.S. interests in international negotiations?

Clearly not. One need only look at their position on military training assistance to the Indonesian Armed Forces. Despite the fact the Indonesian military is a corrupt, brutal institution that has been implicated in the deaths of American citizens, the State Department says that U.S. aid to this institution "provides a vehicle for the United States to impart our ideas about civil-military relations to foreign military audiences, and to promote military reform."

I don't favor training the Indonesian military unless they show they want to reform. Then we can and should help them.

But the ICC is an institution designed to punish the world's worst criminals. The Administration refuses to engage with the ICC, but it will engage with the Indonesian military. If anything, it should be the other way around. We should be working to shape the ICC, an imperfect but potentially valuable institution, to promote U.S. interests, while distancing ourselves from institutions that are corrupt, abusive and incapable of reform.

The administration points to efforts to combat international terrorism as the reason that it wants to restore military training for Indonesia. The same can be said for the ICC. The Court could become an important forum to try dictators or others involved in atrocities—providing an important tool to deter acts of international terrorism.

Another explanation for the administration's policy might be that the United States simply got nowhere during previous negotiating sessions and further engagement simply will not yield results.

In fact, during the negotiations on the Rome Treaty, the U.S. delegation worked to ensure that the Court will serve our national interests by being a strong, effective institution. They succeeded in inserting a number of important safeguards, including provisions to deter frivolous prosecutions.

Like any international agreement, the U.S. did not get 100 percent of what we wanted in the negotiations. However, that is why the U.S. should remain involved with the Court. As the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, has said, U.S. policy toward the International Criminal Court should be one of "aggressive engagement."

Instead, the Bush administration has taken its bat and ball and walked off

the field. While this might make those opposed to the Court feel better, the fact of the matter is that the ICC is a reality—even the Bush administration acknowledges this. It is rapidly becoming operational and will have jurisdiction over offenses committed on the territory of state parties, even if those offenses are committed by the citizens of nonparty states.

Bush administration officials have said over and over that the power of the prosecutor is one of the main reasons that they oppose the ICC. In March, the New York Times reported that, because of the historic role that the United States has played in international justice, many nations sought to appoint an American as Chief Prosecutor to the Court.

I can think of few measures that would have been more effective in accomplishing the Administration's stated goal of guarding against political prosecutions of American soldiers than having an American citizen serve as Chief Prosecutor. However, the New York Times article went on to point out that the Administration's policy of being openly hostile towards the ICC was precluding an American from being appointed to this critical position.

Ultimately, an Argentine was selected as the prosecutor. While this prosecutor appears to be a very capable, distinguished individual, one gets the sense that if U.S. policy towards the ICC had been less hostile, an American would now occupy that position.

The U.S. need not be estranged from the ICC. Our closest allies, almost all of whom are strong supporters of the Court, have made it clear that with or without U.S. ratification of the Rome Treaty they would welcome our involvement in guiding its development.

As a signatory to the final document of the Rome Conference we had the right to participate in all of the various preparatory meetings leading up to the creation of the Court. Despite its concerns about the Court—or rather, because of them—it is bewildering that the Bush administration chose to not even send U.S. representatives to participate in the final negotiations.

Instead of supporting frivolous legislation that declares war on The Hague and would cut off military assistance to a number of key friends and allies, this administration should reconsider its position on the ICC.

By sitting on the sidelines, the United States is losing out on its ability to influence the structure and culture of this important new institution. Each time we refuse to join another treaty or international organization, which has become a pattern of this administration, we erode our international leadership.

I urge the administration to re-engage in a discussion with the Congress, and with our allies, of how the United States can once again play a constructive, leadership role in ensuring that the International Criminal Court effectively carries out its historic mandate.